

BSI OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AGENDA & MINUTES



Meeting Overview

Hosts	Michele LeBleu-Burns & Gregory Anderson
Attendees	MaryAlice Bonilla Howard Irvin Jerry Rosenberg Robert Griffin Diana Lydgate Rowena Tomaneng Lydia Hearn
Absent	Christina Espinosa-Pieb, Marion Winters, Margaret Michaelis
Date & Time	12/09/08 8:30am
Location	De Anza's El Milagro Room

Agenda

1. Agree upon outcomes for this meeting
2. Distribute group scores and means and discuss proposals
3. Rank proposals—according to criteria
4. Total amounts requested by proposals that committee wishes to fund
5. Act upon these proposals
 - a. total < \$70k: Fund all these proposals
 - b. total > \$70k:
 - i. Determine appropriate funding amounts certain proposals?
 - ii. Increase \$70k limit to fund more proposals?
 - iii. Fund certain proposals beyond \$70k that match activities on 08-09 action plan?
6. Determine notification process
7. Discuss next steps (time permitting)

Minutes

Members suggested the following meeting outcomes and priorities:

1. Be cognizant of our financial crisis, especially sustainability, cost per student served, amounts, and overlap. We need to sustain efforts directed at student success and avoid layoffs. Funds may not be available in the future.
2. Some of the proposals are being funded through other resources and even through already allocated BSI funding.
3. Whatever decisions this committee make, Senior Staff will need to review them before any announcements are made.

BSI OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AGENDA & MINUTES



Discuss proposal scores

1. The review process started with RFPs with the lowest scores:
 - a. **Proposal 11: Staff Development in Cultural Competency** was good but needs to be funded through other means. Limited outcome description. Proposal was not approved for funding out of the current \$70k, with the decision to encourage the proposal writer to work with other bodies on campus.
 - b. **Proposal 9: Program Outcomes for the ESL Program** was also good but needs to be funded from other areas. Outcomes will be part of the SLO efforts that began last Spring and are scheduled to resume soon. This proposal was a good reminder of the need for and interest in professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty. Suggested retreats are planned to be funded through Title III. Proposal was not approved for funding.
 - c. **Proposal 2: Cross Cultural Partners (CCP)** was viewed as a good proposal to fund a valuable program. Members generally thought that the outcomes are related to BSI because ESL students benefit from the program. However, the committee would like to see assessment as a fundamental part of the program. Additionally, some members thought that the cost per student was high. Proposal was not approved for funding..
 - d. **Proposal 6: EOPS Part-Time Counselor and Peer Advisors** came about as a result of budget cutbacks that have led to a decrease in the number of counseling hours available and thus a cut in service. There is a need for alternative means of providing service, including peer mentoring. The committee thought the large request for funding was high to be funding from a soft funding source. Members agreed that Counseling, including Peer Counseling, is fundamental to the success of students and needs to be funded from a larger and more permanent basis. Many on the committee agreed that this is one of three general areas that BSI should be cooperating with other funding sources to create long-term and sustainable funding. These three areas that need to be funded are tutoring, counseling, and training adjunct faculty. Counseling work needs to be focused on in a larger way, especially given the need to serve the changing demographics and increasing the examples of counselors working with the faculty members, including the MPS program. On-hold.

At this point in the meeting, there was a discussion of including Senior Management to participate in the RFP process due to the current situation of the funding. The BSI Steering Committee decided to move forward with the review process. Then, when the Committee has reviewed all the proposals, it can provide an update to the proposal writers. However, the committee will submit their funding recommendations to Senior Management and will look for solutions and input.

BSI OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AGENDA & MINUTES



-
- e. **Proposal 3: Curriculum Development for a 2-Unit Math Study Skills Class** was suggested that it be funded from Title III. There is overlap with development for adjunct faculty and other Title III teams. The request is for one-time funding for a course that is done and then continues to run itself without future funding.
2. The review process continued with RFPs with the highest scores:
- a. **Proposal 15: Theory to Praxis: Basic Skills Methodology in Instructor Training** received the highest score. Comments were made on how the proposal was not specific to any discipline. Some members found this to be a valuable feature of the proposal, while others suggested that faculty members in certain disciplines will reject any training which they don't see as directly applicable to teaching their discipline's content. Discussion on how this could become the theme, in cooperation with the other grants at the Teaching and Learning Conference—because the reputation is already established, and not only teachers who see that they are serving Basic Skills students will come. The Committee decided that this proposal would be funded to run the first part of the conference where the first half or more of the day would be on learning theory as it applies to the needs of basic skills students, and the second half of the day would be discipline-specific. In short, the Teaching and Learning Conference would be followed up with a series of more focused workshops throughout the year, in a sense, using the T&L Conference as a kickoff for a larger professional development effort. BSI would pay for part of this overall effort and ask the other grants to contribute as well.
- b. **Proposal 7: Fourth Annual DSILC (De Anza Summer Institute for Learning Communities)** received the second highest score. A suggestion was made to fund part of the proposal where the remainder would be funded from two other grants. The question arose if the proposal should be part of a greater funded effort in adjunct faculty development, as in "X% of incoming BSI funds should be allocated to the three areas of tutoring, staff development, and counseling". Cultural competency needs to be a strong part of the program.
- c. **Proposal 13: Supplemental Instruction: Reading Based Tutoring** received the third highest score. Questions were raised regarding load, the students served (i.e., the students served should be at the developmental level), and sustainability. A suggestion was made to develop a training program for tutors (like LRNA97), check for duplication, and how to read science and math classes—what about the READ80 class. This and Proposal 14, below should happen, but perhaps as a part of faculty efforts in Title III.

BSI OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AGENDA & MINUTES



- d. **Proposal 14: *Supplemental Instruction Workshops Integrating Counseling & Reading*** was a good proposal but the question arose if this already happening (i.e., the counseling courses like HUMA20 and in SKILLS classes). 13 and 14 actually together—if you are not making a course. Either way, get whoever is working on this, and start working with the Title III teams (both math and faculty) working together, once again not sustainable, so need to get a class.

At this point in the meeting, there was discussion regarding how campus grant work needs more collaboration and for the silos to be broken. We are making progress. Staffing precludes getting more sections open.

- e. **Proposal 4: *Developing a Flow Model from Assessment to Collegiate Course Success*** funded at 21k (three quarters at \$7k, approximately the equivalent of one course per quarter). Proposal writer can decide for himself how he wants to use those funds to hire the best assistant possible.
- f. **Proposal 12: *Staff Development Seminars: Creating the Best Learning Outcomes for EWRT*** was a strong proposal. Student learning outcomes, efforts in which were started last year, are coming and probably will once again become part of a much larger campus-wide effort. Proposal was not approved at this time..
- g. **Proposal 5: *Early Warning System*** was a good proposal but there was some reservations regarding using a computer based approach for students at the basic skills level. Most of the funding would be to test the efficiency of the initial free piloting of the software and the recycled computer program should be brought in the classroom, outcomes would be decisions to see if this software helped. Because of concerns about sustainability, specifically about whether other faculty would use this software and this approach, it was decided that the writer of this proposal should work with the Title III Math Faculty Team,

Meeting adjourned with the decision to finish this fruitful discussion at the next meeting.

Next Meeting

Hosts	Michele LeBleu-Burns & Gregory Anderson
Attendees	BSI Oversight Committee
Date & Time	January 6, 2009 10:30-11:30
Location	ADM106
Agenda	Finish evaluating proposals